

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-30 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. Claims 1, 3-9, 12, 14-16, 18-24, 27, and 29 have been amended. Claims 2, 10, 11, 17, 25, and 26 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 18-24, and 27-30 remain pending.

II. Rejections and Responses to Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Iverson, Lee, "NODAL: A Filesystem for Ubiquitous Collaboration" ("NODAL") in view of Armstrong, Eric, "[unrev-II] Meeting Summary: 4 May 2000" (called "Iverson" in the Office Action). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

NODAL and Iverson, alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the features of claims 1-30 as previously presented. The claims are directed to associating business logic in a distributed document object model system. Business logic generally refers to business rules that implement business policy or goals and a business logic event handler encapsulates business rules and handles events. An example of a business rule and how it is handled is provided in paragraph [0083] of Applicants' specification, in which it is described how an expense report may be modified to require additional approval if it exceeds a certain amount.

The Office Action states that the cursor in NODAL corresponds to the business logic event handler as recited in the claims, pointing to NODAL at pages 20, 21, 26, and 27. (Office Action, pp. 3-4.) The Office Action is incorrect. The cursor in NODAL is an intermediate object that enables a program to access nodes in a repository. (NODAL, p. 20.) The cursor enables the evaluation of permissions and the maintenance of an audit trail. (*Id.*) The cursor does not encapsulate business rules and handle events. Therefore, the cursor in NODAL does not correspond to the business logic event handler as recited in the claims.

Although Applicants disagree with the rejections of claims 1-30, they have nevertheless amended claims to more distinctly claim their inventions. For example, amended claims 1, 3-9, and 12-15 now recite:

performing a function relating to the received indication, wherein the performed function applies a business rule that causes a second modification to the hierarchical document.

Support for these amendments may be found, e.g., at paragraph [0081] of Applicants' specification, in which it is described how business logic may be enforced that causes further mutations to a document based upon requested mutations. Amended claim 1 recites that applying the business rule causes a second modification to the same document to which a first modification was made. Neither NODAL nor Iverson teach or suggest the features of amended claim 1. At best, NODAL describes automatically updating client copies of server documents. (See NODAL, p. 10.) However, this does not correspond to making a first modification to a document and applying a business rule to make a second modification to the same document. Iverson, which describes a Distributed Document Object Model, fails to cure the deficiencies of NODAL with respect to amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, NODAL and Iverson, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, amended claims 1, 3-9, and 12-15 are patentable over NODAL and Iverson. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-9 and 12-15.

Claims 16, 18-24, and 27-30 now recite:

wherein the function performed includes applying the business rule, thereby making a second modification to the hierarchical document

As described above, neither NODAL nor Iverson teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the applied references.


III. Conclusion

The claims each recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the applied references and so cannot properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 or 103.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: 11/30/07

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rajiv P. Sarathy

Registration No.: 55,592
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant